

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>M.1.0</i>	<i>BASIS FOR AWARD.....</i>	<i>1</i>
M.1.1	Initial Screening	1
M.1.2	Basis for Award	1
<i>M.2.0</i>	<i>EVALUATION PROCESS.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>M.3.0</i>	<i>EVALUATION FACTORS.....</i>	<i>2</i>
M.3.1	Volume I: Technical Evaluation Factors.....	2
M.3.2	Volume II - Management Evaluation Factors	12
M.3.3	Cost/Contract Documentation Proposal Evaluation Factors	20

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1.0 BASIS FOR AWARD**M.1.1 Initial Screening**

The Government plans on screening all responses to assure that they are complete and in accordance with all provisions of this RFO/SIR. Based on the results of this screening, the Government reserves the right to disqualify an Offeror from further consideration when its Proposal is clearly non-responsive to the Government's requirements.

M.1.2 Basis for Award

The Government anticipates awarding a single contract for the work defined in this RFO/SIR. Award will be made to the Offeror whose Proposal conforms to the requirements of this RFO/SIR and provides the best overall value to the Government, cost and other factors considered. Therefore, the lowest total evaluated price may not provide the best overall value to the Government. Offerors eliminated at any time during the evaluation process will not have their proposals considered further. The Government reserves the right to make no award in response to this RFO/SIR if it deems no proposal represents the best value to the Government, estimated costs and other factors considered.

Order of Importance: Volume I (Technical) is significantly more important than Volume II (Management). Both Volumes I (Technical) and Volume II (Management) are significantly more important than Volume III (Cost). However, as the differences in Volume I (Technical) and Volume II (Management) scores between Offerors decrease, the importance of Volume III (Cost) will increase.

Eligibility for Award: To be eligible for award, the Offeror must be determined to be financially viable and otherwise responsible in accordance with the guidelines contained in paragraph L.10.

The Government reserves the right to award a contract immediately following the conclusion of all evaluations. Therefore, it is critical that each Proposal be fully responsive to this RFO/SIR and its provisions.

In evaluating the proposals, the Government may conduct written or oral communications with any and/or all Offerors. Additionally, the Government reserves the right to conduct communications and negotiations with any individual competing Offeror, or all competing Offerors, as the situation warrants.

If at any point during the evaluation process, the Government concludes that the Offeror does not have a reasonable chance of receiving this award, the Government may eliminate the Offeror from further consideration for award. Any Offeror eliminated from further consideration will be officially notified in writing.

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.2.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

During the evaluation process, the Government will evaluate each Offeror's approach to perform the requirements specified in this RFO/SIR, as measured by the following:

1. Initial screening of proposals for compliance to the requirements of this RFO/SIR
2. Formal evaluation of the Offeror's Technical Proposal (Volume I)
3. Formal evaluation of the Offeror's Management Proposal (Volume II)
4. Formal evaluation of the Offeror's Cost/Contract Documentation Proposal (Volume III)

M.3.0 EVALUATION FACTORS

Each proposal volume will be evaluated in accordance with the factors listed below. The Offeror's responses will be objectively rated based on the evaluation criteria. An overall score for each Offeror will be developed based on a composite score for each factor.

Evaluation of Volumes I and II will consider the following general criteria relative to each factor:

1. Strengths and Weaknesses: Strengths and weaknesses of a proposed approach will be identified. Attention will be focused on elements of a proposed approach that are beyond merely satisfying or not satisfying requirements.
2. Substantiation: The degree to which the Offeror presents analyses or other factual data to justify and demonstrate that a proposed approach will satisfy requirements. Substantiation includes the quality and thoroughness of the information provided to support the response.

Definitions:

Strengths: That part of a proposal which ultimately represents an added benefit to the Government and is expected to increase the quality of the Offeror's performance.

Strengths are typically high quality personnel, available tools, facilities, organizational structures and/or technical approaches that allow the Offeror to perform the work more cost effectively or at a higher level of quality.

Weaknesses: That part of a proposal which detracts from the Offeror's ability to meet the Government's requirements or results in inefficient or ineffective performance.

Weaknesses are typically lower-than-average quality personnel, lack of appropriate tools, facilities, organizational structures and/or technical approaches that cause the Offeror to perform the work less cost effectively or at a lower level of quality.

M.3.1 Volume I: Technical Evaluation Factors

Offerors will be evaluated on how their proposal addresses the following for **each** technical factor and subfactor:

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1. Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates successful outcome on similar programs and relates this successful outcome to the factors and subfactors.
2. Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of and documents the risks associated with each technical factor and subfactor. Degree to which the Offeror provides risk mitigation strategies for each risk documented.

The following factors and subfactors apply to the Offeror's Technical Proposal.

Factors 2 and 4 are of equal importance and are more important than Factors 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7. Factors 1 and 3 are of equal importance and are more important than Factors 5, 6 and 7. Factors 6 and 7 are of equal importance, but are less important than Factor 5.

Technical Factor 1 – TMA System Knowledge

Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates its depth of technical and operational knowledge of the existing system. Degree to which Offeror demonstrates understanding of: 1) TMA system functionality and how that capability supports air traffic operations within the NAS; 2) System infrastructure and TMA technical integration within the NAS; 3) TMA system users, participating organizations, and stakeholders; 4) Technical, operational, and other shortfalls and challenges of the existing TMA system; and 5) TMA site adaptation.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if knowledge of the TMA system is not clearly demonstrated.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if knowledge of the TMA system functionality and capability is demonstrated.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if average criteria are met and an understanding of the TMA infrastructure and integration within the NAS is demonstrated.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if above average criteria are met and knowledge of site adaptation, system challenges, and overall system functionality is demonstrated.

Technical Factor 2 – System Architecture Approach

Subfactor B is significantly more important than A, C, and D. Subfactors A, C, and D are equally weighted.

Subfactor A	System Evolution Approach
	Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates an approach that achieves continuity for sustaining and evolving the existing system to TBFM with minimal impact to the system, users and NAS.

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

<p>The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if none of the criteria are addressed.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Average if the approach demonstrates continuity in evolving the existing system to TBFM and demonstrates a complete and realistic proposed schedule.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if average criteria are met and the Offeror demonstrates knowledge of program risk, and provides appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Outstanding if above average criteria are met and the overall approach is innovative and comprehensive relative to the existing system.</p>	
Subfactor B	System Re-Architecture
<p>Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a solution that meets the contractual requirements and minimizes the overall program risk.</p> <p>Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a solution that is innovative.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if none of the criteria are addressed.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Average if the solution meets the contractual requirements for the overall architecture.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if average criteria are met and the Offeror demonstrates knowledge of program risk, and provides appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Outstanding if above average criteria are met and the overall solution is innovative and comprehensive relative to the existing system.</p>	
Subfactor C	Functional Architecture
<p>Degree to which the Offeror addresses the relationship of users to the architecture and operation.</p> <p>Degree to which the Offeror substantiates decisions made at the functional architecture level that ensures TBFM viability as the TBFM system and external interfacing systems evolve.</p> <p>Degree to which the Offeror describes the key software requirements and performance</p>	

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

constraints that determined the proposed architecture.

Degree to which the Offeror presents justification for key architecture, significant alternatives, trade-offs, and considerations made during the development of the functional architecture.

Degree to which the Offeror describes how the architecture supports the organization, storage, retrieval, validation, security, and integrity of system data.

Degree to which the Offeror addresses CHI aspects of the proposed functional architecture.

Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates how the proposed functional architecture supports the flexibility for viewing and manipulating data and performing functions at diverse facilities.

Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates how the functional architecture affects the processor and display footprint in the operational quarters.

Degree to which the Offeror describes the impact of functional architecture on communication bandwidth needs.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** none of the criteria are addressed.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if the solution meets the contractual requirements for the overall architecture and addresses criteria such as the relationship of users to the architecture, key software requirements and performance constraints, CHI aspects, how the processor and display footprint are affected and of functional architecture on bandwidth.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if average criteria are met and the Offeror demonstrates knowledge of program risk and provides appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk and addresses criteria such as justification of architecture, support of system data and flexibility for viewing and manipulating data.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if above average criteria are met and the overall approach is innovative and comprehensive relative to the existing system.

Subfactor D	Physical Architecture
--------------------	------------------------------

Degree to which the Offeror identifies and describes the hardware selected for the system.
--

Degree to which the Offeror identifies, for the proposed physical architecture, the locations of the physical components at the system level, and both the risks and trade-offs performed in selecting the architecture.
--

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Degree to which the Offeror's proposed physical architecture addresses hardware devices and protocols used for communications.

Degree to which the Offeror provides assumptions made pertaining to the communications infrastructure that supports the proposed architecture.

Degree to which the Offeror includes a description of the degrees of fault tolerance and redundancy provided by the architecture and how they affect TBFM availability requirements and NAS operations.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if none of the criteria are addressed.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if the solution meets the contractual requirements for the overall architecture and addresses criteria such as selected hardware, location of physical components, hardware devices and protocols for communication, fault tolerance and redundancy.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if average criteria are met and the Offeror demonstrates knowledge of program risk, and provides appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if above average criteria are met and the overall solution is innovative and comprehensive relative to the existing system.

Technical Factor 3 –Approach to Sustainment

Subfactor A is more important than B.

Subfactor A	Sustainment Engineering
Extent to which the proposed engineering processes and procedures establish a basis for system sustainment that minimizes the overall program risks.	
The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if none of the criteria are addressed.	
The Offeror's response will be found Average if the approach demonstrates processes and procedures that are compliant with the contractual requirements.	
The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if average criteria are met and the Offeror demonstrates knowledge of program risk, and provides appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk.	
The Offeror's response will be found Outstanding if above average criteria are met and the processes and procedures are comprehensive relative to the existing system.	

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Subfactor B	Problem Processes and Procedures
Effectiveness of the proposed processes and procedures to facilitate in a timely manner detecting, tracking and correcting problems.	
The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if none of the criteria are addressed.	
The Offeror's response will be found Average if the proposal demonstrates processes and procedures that are compliant with the contractual requirements and addresses criteria such as effective detection, tracking and correcting of problems.	
The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if average criteria are met and the Offeror demonstrates knowledge of program risk, and provides appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk.	
The Offeror's response will be found Outstanding if above average criteria are met and the processes and procedures are comprehensive relative to the existing system.	

Technical Factor 4 – Approach to the Design, Development, and Implementation of the TBFM System

The following subfactors are of equal importance.

Subfactor A	System Engineering Approach
Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates technical soundness, thoroughness, and clarity of the approach.	
The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if none of the criteria are addressed.	
The Offeror's response will be found Average if the approach is compliant with the contractual requirements.	
The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if average criteria are met and the Offeror demonstrates knowledge of program risk, and provides appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk.	
The Offeror's response will be found Outstanding if above average criteria are met and the overall approach is comprehensive relative to the existing system.	
Subfactor B	System Engineering Process
Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective system engineering process model and procedures.	
Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates how the model will be applied in all phases	

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

of the system life cycle.

Degree to which the proposed processes demonstrate an effective approach to system engineering tasks relevant to system design, development, test, implementation, training, maintenance and transition.

Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an approach for successful algorithm development and validation.

Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates effective processes and procedures for conducting requirements analyses and development.

Degree to which the proposed engineering processes facilitate incremental delivery of TBFM capabilities and benefits.

Degree to which engineering process addresses COTS and NDI components.

Degree to which engineering processes addresses technical risk, safety and security of the system.

Degree to which engineering processes address stakeholder involvement.

Degree to which the processes ensure completeness and realism of proposed schedule, milestones, and deliverable dates.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if none of the criteria are addressed.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if the proposal demonstrates processes and procedures that are compliant with the contractual requirements and addresses criteria such as stakeholder involvement, process model, procedures, and methods, COTS and NDI and a complete and realistic proposed schedule.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if average criteria are met and the Offeror addresses program risk, safety and security of the system and provide appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if above average criteria are met and the process is comprehensive relative to the existing system.

Subfactor C	Development Environment
--------------------	--------------------------------

Breadth, cohesion, and degree of automation offered by the engineering toolset and development environment used to track requirements.

Extent to which the development environment facilitates development uniformity among subsystems.

Degree to which the effectiveness of the development environment in facilitating

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

technical reviews, providing the Government insight into the evolving system, and transitioning from development to operations and maintenance.

Degree to which development environment supports engineering analysis, design, software development, test, deployment, maintenance, effective human factors engineering, program security requirements, and release approach.

Degree to which Offeror identifies and tracks problem reports and change requests; release contents and timelines.

Extent to which the benefits and risks associated with the proposed development environment and tools are addressed.

Degree to which the development environment allows for remote electronic access to data.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if none of the criteria are addressed.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if the approach is compliant with the contractual requirements and addresses criteria such as toolsets, facilitation of technical reviews, human factors engineering and transitioning from development to O&M.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if average criteria are met and the overall program risk is minimized by identifying risks and providing appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if above average criteria are met and the Offeror demonstrates criteria such as cohesion and automation provided by the toolset or environment.

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Subfactor D	Implementation Approach
	<p>Degree to which there is a rationale behind the approach, the feasibility and effectiveness of proposed implementation, and the need for parallel operations or incremental deliveries if applicable.</p> <p>Degree to which the approach demonstrates adequacy of testing and training prior to implementation.</p> <p>Degree to which the proposed implementation approach provides confidence that the Offeror will efficiently and effectively transition from development and implementation to operations with minimal risk and disruption to operations.</p> <p>Degree to which the Offeror ensures that the new system performs as well as the existing system operationally and technically.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if none of the criteria are addressed.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Average if the approach is compliant with the contractual requirements and addresses criteria such as the system will be appropriately tested and the users appropriately trained prior to implementation.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if average criteria are met and the overall program risk is minimized by identifying risks and providing appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk and addresses criteria such as an effective and efficient transition from development to operations.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Outstanding if above average criteria are met and the approach is innovative and comprehensive relative to the existing system.</p>

Technical Factor 5 – Transition Period Approach

Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates that its approach for the transition of the existing TMA system ensures continuity of maintenance and adaptation changes while minimizing risk and disruption to users and stakeholders. Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates provisions for a smooth transition from the previous vendor.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if none of the criteria are addressed.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if the approach demonstrates continuity on transitioning the existing system.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if average criteria are met and the Offeror demonstrates knowledge of program risk, and provides appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk.

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if above average criteria are met and the approach is innovative and comprehensive relative to the existing system.

Technical Factor 6 - System and Software Engineering Capability

Ability of the Offeror's Team to demonstrate the processes and procedures to meet the ISO standard(s) and CMMI/iCMM standard(s) for System Engineering and/or Software Engineering. Degree to which the Offeror describes the approach to ensure the SOA/IONA knowledge and expertise remains throughout the program life cycle.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if the processes and procedures are incomplete, inconsistent, and not compliant with ISO 9000 and CMMI/iCMM level 3.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if Contractor's performing work on TBFM program documents, meet and maintain ISO 9000 compliance and CMMI/iCMM Level 3.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if Contractor's performing work on TBFM programs documents, meet and maintain ISO 9000 compliance and CMMI/iCMM Level 4 and demonstrates a clear and comprehensive approach to SOA lifecycle retention.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if the Contractors performing work on TBFM programs documents, meet and maintain ISO 9000 compliance and CMMI/iCMM Level 5 and demonstrates a clear and comprehensive approach to SOA lifecycle retention.

Technical Factor 7 – Approach to Life Cycle Cost Effectiveness

Degree to which features of the TBFM system provide for cost effective system management, operability, and maintenance once deployed Degree to which proposed technical approach (design, development, and transition) contains features that provide for cost effective execution of engineering activities, in both development and maintenance; minimize training requirements; and maximize training efficiency.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if none of the criteria are addressed.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if the approach demonstrates continuity on transitioning the existing system and addresses criteria such as methods for cost effective system management, execution of engineering activities and features that minimize training requirements and maximize training efficiency

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if average criteria are met and the overall program risk is minimized by identifying risks and providing appropriate mitigation strategies for each risk and overall program risk.

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if above average criteria are met and the approach is innovative and comprehensive relative to the existing system.

M.3.2 Volume II - Management Evaluation Factors

The following Evaluation Factors apply to the Offeror's Management proposal. Factors 2, 3 and 5 are of equal importance and more important than factors 1 and 4.

Management Factor 1 – Management Organization

The following subfactors are listed in descending order of importance.

Subfactor A	Organizational Structure
	<p>Degree to which the proposed organizational structure demonstrates a clear understanding of program requirements, priorities, and risks. Extent to which proposed lines of communication and escalation procedures provide confidence that program status, issues, and risks will be effectively identified, communicated, addressed, and resolved. Degree to which the proposed organizational structure facilitates effective program execution.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if the proposed organizational structure does not demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirement, priorities, and risks.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Average if the proposed organizational structure demonstrates a clear understanding of the requirement, priorities, and risks.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if the proposed organizational structure meets the average criteria and demonstrates effective lines of communication and facilitates effective program execution.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Outstanding if the proposed organizational structure meets the above average criteria and demonstrates a comprehensive and substantiated approach to organizing the structure necessary to successfully execute the program.</p>
Subfactor B	Staffing Plan
	<p>Degree to which the proposed Staffing Plan demonstrates an understanding of program requirements. Degree to which the Staffing Plan provides confidence that the staff categories and effort levels proposed are appropriate in the phases assigned.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if the proposed staffing plan does not reflect an understanding of the program requirements.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Average if the proposed staffing plan reflects an understanding of the program requirements.</p>

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if the proposed staffing plan meets the average criteria and that the staff categories and effort levels proposed are appropriate in the phases assigned.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if the proposed staffing plan meets the above average criteria and demonstrates a comprehensive and substantiated approach to a staffing plan necessary to successfully execute the program.

Subfactor C	Obtaining and Retaining Qualified Personnel
--------------------	--

Degree to which the proposed approach to obtaining and retaining qualified personnel, to support Volume I technical requirements, provides confidence that the Offeror will be able to achieve the proposed Staffing Plan and minimize program risk associated with staff turnover throughout the life of the program.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if the proposed approach to acquiring and retaining qualified staff to support Volume I technical requirements is insufficient.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if the proposed approach to acquiring and retaining qualified staff to support Volume I technical requirements demonstrates the ability to meet program needs.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if the proposed approach to acquiring and retaining qualified staff meets the average criteria and demonstrates the ability to create a superior workplace.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if the proposed approach to acquiring and retaining qualified staff meets the above average criteria and demonstrates a comprehensive and substantiated approach to a staff retention plan necessary to successfully and continuously execute the program.

Management Factor 2 – Program Management Approach

The following subfactors are listed in descending order of importance with subfactors B and C being of equal importance.

Subfactor A	Management Process
--------------------	---------------------------

Degree to which the proposed management processes, tools, and techniques provide confidence that the Offeror will effectively and efficiently plan, execute, monitor, and control its efforts and the efforts of all subcontractors to meet contractual requirements and assure quality in a timely and cost effective manner. Extent to which the proposed processes provide confidence that potential changes to the project baseline will be identified early and appropriate mechanisms will be utilized to correct variances and control changes. Degree to which the proposed WBS is complete, suitable for the TBFM program, and effectively aligned with the Government provided WBS and the Offeror's proposed approach.

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if the proposed management process does not demonstrate an approach that will meet contractual requirements and assure quality in a timely and cost effective manner.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if the proposed management process demonstrates an approach that will meet contractual requirements and assure quality in a timely and cost effective manner.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if the proposed management process meets the average criteria and shows the ability to adapt the management process to align with changing priorities.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if the proposed management process meets the above average criteria and demonstrates a comprehensive and substantiated approach to the management process and its probability to lead to the successful execution of the program.

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Subfactor B	Earned Value Management
<p>Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates compliant with EIA-748. Degree to which the proposed earned value management approach is clear and part of the Offeror's current management processes. Extent to which proposed tools automate activities and minimize errors. Degree to which the approach provides confidence that cost and schedule progress will be accurately measured, that cost and schedule variances will be identified in a timely manner, and that adequate linkage exists with other components of the management process to implement effective corrective actions and process improvements. Extent to which subcontractors are integrated into the proposed EVM approach.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if the earned value management approach is unclear and not part of the Offeror's current management processes or does not demonstrate compliance with EIA-748.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Average if the earned value management approach is clear and part of the Offeror's current management processes and demonstrates some compliance with EIA-748.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if the earned value management approach is clear and part of the Offeror's current management processes and meets all of the criteria in EIA-748 but has not been certified by an independent and government accepted authority.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Outstanding if the earned value management approach meets above average criteria and when the Offeror's response provides a system which has been certified by an independent and government accepted authority as EIA-748 compliant.</p>	
Subfactor C	Risk Management Approach
<p>Degree to which the proposed risk management approach provides confidence that relevant risk will be identified, prioritized, and mitigated throughout the life of the project. Extent to which the initial list of identified risks and corresponding mitigation strategies provides confidence that the Offeror will successfully manage risk and meet overall program requirements.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if the risk management approach does not provide confidence that relevant risks will be identified, prioritized, and mitigated throughout the life of the project.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Average if the risk management approach provides confidence that relevant risks will be identified, prioritized, and mitigated throughout the life of the project and the initial list of identified risks includes several of the FAA identified program risks</p>	

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if the risk management approach meets the average criteria and the initial list of identified risks includes almost all of the FAA identified program risks.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if the risk management approach meets the above average criteria and demonstrates a comprehensive and substantiated approach to the reduction of risk contributing to the success of the program.

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Management Factor 3 – Personnel

The following subfactors are listed in descending order of importance with subfactor A being significantly more important than subfactor B.

Subfactor A	Key Personnel
	<p>Degree to which the qualifications (experience, education, and certifications) of proposed key personnel demonstrate the knowledge and experience needed to successfully fill prescribed key personnel roles. The extent to which skills and experience of proposed key personnel aligns with the skills and experience required by the Offeror's proposed design and approach. Degree to which the proposed key personnel provide confidence that the Offeror will meet program requirements and successfully implement the proposed solution with minimal risk to the Government.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if the qualifications (experience, education, and certification) of proposed key personnel do not demonstrate the knowledge and experience needed to successfully fill prescribed key personnel roles.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Average if the qualifications (experience, education, and certification) of proposed key personnel demonstrate the knowledge and experience needed to successfully fill prescribed key personnel roles.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if the key personnel plan meets the average criteria and if the skills and experience of a majority of key personnel exceed the minimum qualifications as defined in Section H.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Outstanding if the key personnel plan meets the above average criteria and if the skills and experience of all key personnel exceed the minimum qualifications as defined in Section H.</p>
Subfactor B	Staff Expertise
	<p>Degree to which the Offeror possesses sufficient depth of experienced resources (including subcontractors), beyond those cited as key personnel, required to successfully complete the program. The extent to which non-key resources are experienced in the technologies, methodologies, and development approach proposed by the Offeror. Degree to which Offeror has identified and committed resources beyond the key personnel.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if the Offeror does not demonstrate the possession of sufficient depth of experienced resources, beyond those cited as key personnel, required to successfully complete the program.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Average if the Offeror demonstrates the possession of sufficient depth of experienced resources, beyond those cited as key personnel, required to successfully complete the program.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if the staff expertise meets the</p>

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

average criteria and non-key resources are experienced in the technologies, methodologies, and/or development approach proposed by the Offeror as documented on previous similar programs.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if the staff expertise meets the above average criteria and proves that provided non-key resources significantly enhance the ability to successfully complete the program.

Management Factor 4 – Quantitative Performance Measurement Approach

The following subfactors are listed in descending order of importance.

Subfactor A	Performance Measurement Approach
	<p>Completeness and feasibility of performance measurement approach in addressing program progress and product quality. Effectiveness of approach in addressing all phases of the program life cycle. Effectiveness of measurement system in facilitating Government insight into program progress and status. Degree to which performance goals are established, measured, analyzed, and used to maintain performance within acceptable limits. Degree to which approach demonstrates an understanding of and commitment to performance measurement. Completeness, effectiveness, and feasibility of method for identifying, measuring, and tracking data that supports investment analyses.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Unsatisfactory if the performance measurement approach does not demonstrate the completeness and feasibility in addressing program progress and product quality.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Average if the performance measurement approach demonstrates the completeness and feasibility in addressing program progress and product quality.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Above Average if the performance measurement approach meets the average criteria and demonstrates an understanding of and commitment to performance measurement and show completeness, effectiveness, and feasibility of method for identifying, measuring, and tracking data that supports investment analyses.</p> <p>The Offeror's response will be found Outstanding if the performance measurement approach meets the above average criteria and comprehensively addresses and substantially shows significant strengths with few or no weaknesses.</p>
Subfactor B	Metrics
	<p>Adequacy and completeness of proposed metrics. Appropriateness of metrics by life cycle phase. Usefulness of proposed metrics in gauging performance to plan and assessing the quality of resulting products. Effectiveness of proposed metrics in identifying problems early and tracking critical indicators. Degree to which proposed metrics demonstrate insight into risks associated with TBFM evolution from a technical</p>

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

and operational perspective. Extensiveness and viability of metrics that support investment analysis activities.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if the metrics does not demonstrate to be adequate and complete and does not prove to be useful in gauging performance to plan and assess the quality of resulting products.

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if the metrics demonstrate to be adequate and complete and prove to be useful in gauging performance to plan and assess the quality of resulting products.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if the metrics meet the average criteria and demonstrate insight into risks associated with TBFM evolution from a technical and operational perspective.

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if the metrics meet the above average criteria and comprehensively address and substantially show significant strengths with few or no weaknesses.

Management Factor 5: Past Performance

Demonstrated successful performance with other projects similar to the TBFM effort in size, scope and complexity. Successful past performance will be evaluated based on the Offeror's written response as well as on input from individuals and organizations familiar with the work efforts, products and schedule and cost performance of each Offeror, as demonstrated through previous or ongoing contracts of a similar size, scope and complexity. The Government reserves the right to contact prior clients of the Offeror, subcontractors and consultants, including references other than those identified by the Offeror, and to use those results in this evaluation.

The Offeror's response will be found **Unsatisfactory** if the past performance does not demonstrate successful performance with other projects similar to the TBFM effort in size, scope, and complexity. (Past performance will be based on the Offeror's written response as well as on input from individuals and organizations familiar with the work efforts, products and schedule and cost performance of each Offeror, as demonstrated through previous or ongoing contracts of a similar size, scope, and complexity).

The Offeror's response will be found **Average** if the past performance demonstrates successful performance with other projects similar to the TBFM effort in size, scope, and complexity.

The Offeror's response will be found **Above Average** if the past performance meets the average criteria and describes quality awards or certifications that indicate the Offeror possesses a high quality process for developing and producing the product or service required and interview results prove to score high and show past success.

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Offeror's response will be found **Outstanding** if the past performance meets the above average criteria and interview results prove to score extremely high and show exceptional past success.

M.3.3 Cost/Contract Documentation Proposal Evaluation Factors

The Government will evaluate Cost/Contract Documentation proposals to determine whether the proposed costs and prices are reasonable -- that is, not excessive. It will also determine whether the proposed costs are realistic -- that is neither significantly overstated nor significantly understated relative to what the Offeror can rationally be expected to incur during contract performance. The Government reserves the right to adjust the proposed costs if it determines that they are unrealistic.

The Government also reserves the right to conclude that unrealistically high or low proposed costs are indicative of the Offeror's lack of understanding of the Government's requirements.